


IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: David Fusari
Serial No.: 10/632,673
Confirmation No.: 2695
Filed: August 1, 2003
For: METHODS AND APPARATUS FOR PERFORMING CONTEXT
MANAGEMENT IN A NETWORKED ENVIRONMENT
Examiner: D. Y. Eng
Art Unit: 2155

Certificate of Electronic Filing Under 37 CFR 1.8	
I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.8(a)(4).	
Dated: 9/18/08	 Elnora A. Andriolo

RESPONSE TO OFFICE COMMUNICATION

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Communication mailed August 19, 2008 ("Communication").

The Communication contends that "Applicants' amendment and remarks submitted on April 15, 2008 are not proper because they are made with respect to the amendment and the remarks submitted on April 26, 2008. The amendment and remarks submitted on April 26 have not been entered because they are submitted as informal draft for the interview on 3/03/2008."

Applicant's representative telephoned the Examiner on September 10, 2008 to discuss the Communication because no amendment was filed in connection with the present application on April 26, 2008 and no interview was conducted on March 3, 2008. During this conversation, which

is summarized below and included a discussion of the timeline and content of all Office Actions issued and responses filed in connection with the present application, it became apparent that the claim listing included in the Response To Notice Of Non-Compliant Amendment filed April 11, 2008 failed to indicate, using underlining and struck-through text and a claim status indication of "currently amended," the claim amendments made in the Response To Office Action filed February 22, 2008. Rather, the claims in the Response To Non-Compliant Amendment filed April 11, 2008 reflected the changes to the claims Applicant had intended to make in the Response To Office Action filed February 22, 2008, but did not identify these changes using underlining or struck-through text, and each claim that had been changed included a status indication of "previously presented." As a result, the Examiner was unable to discern from the Response To Non-Compliant Amendment the amendments made to the claims since the last response filed in this application (i.e., the Response To Restriction Requirement filed September 4, 2007).

The claim listing included herewith reflects all amendments made since the last response using underlining and struck-through text, and identifies each amended claim using a status indication of "currently amended." The content of the remainder of this paper is identical to the Response To Office Action filed February 22, 2008, except that the formal drawings filed with that Response are not also enclosed herewith, the new claims introduced in that Response are numbered 71-74 rather than 63-65, and all references to the new claims in the Remarks section are to claims 71-74 rather than claims 63-66.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing beginning on page 3 of this paper.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 12 of this paper.